

To Robert Davis 571 273 8300

APR 17 2007

Application/Control Number: 09/955,671

Page 2

Art Unit: 1722 SAIL KATTA REDDY

CEL#217 819 0096

DETAILED ACTION***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-7, an apparatus for providing a plurality of perforations in a dough layer prior to baking, in the reply filed on January 10, 2006 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

- ✓ 1. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 are objected to because of the following informalities.
Appropriate correction is required.
- ✓ 2. Regarding claim 1, there should only be one period located at the very end of the claim. All periods within the claim should be replaced with semicolons or commas.
- ✓ 3. Regarding claim 2, it does not further limit the structure of the invention. In addition, the word "wherein" is misspelled.
- ✓ 4. Regarding claim 4, it does not further limit the structure of the invention.
- ✓ 5. Regarding claim 6, the word "claim" is misspelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Turner (US 2,246,424).

Appropriate correction to claims 1,2,4, and 6 as required are as follows:

CLAIM 1: An apparatus for providing a plurality of perforations in a dough layer prior to baking, the apparatus comprising: a top portion, a top portion having certain weight; a top portion, the top portion including an upper surface of the apparatus; a top portion, the top portion having a bottom surface; a plurality of nail like objects being arranged in a fixed pattern; handles means to aid in lifting the tool, handles being arranged in a fixed pattern.

(Corrections were made regarding the usage of period, semicolons and commas as suggested).

CLAIM 2: The apparatus in claim 1, wherein the weight of the top portion means to provide pressure on the nail like objects to penetrate through the dough layer.

(Deleting this claim 2 since it does not further limit the structure of the invention).
(Misspelled word 'wherin' has been corrected to 'wherein').

CLAIM 3: The apparatus in claim 1, wherein a top portion having a bottom surface means to provide locations for the plurality of nail like objects arranged in a fixed pattern.

(No correction was suggested regarding claim 3).

CLAIM 4: The apparatus in claim 1, wherein the entire apparatus is manually lowered directly on to the dough layer to be perforated.

(Deleting this claim 4, since it does not further limit the structure of the invention).

CLAIM 5: The apparatus in claim 1, wherein the ends of the nail like objects having narrow pointed ends to provide quick penetrating capability.

(No correction was suggested regarding claim 5).

CLAIM 6: The nail like objects in claim 1, wherein the plurality of nail like objects are arranged such that all the pointed ends of the nail like objects are pointing downwards in the direction of gravity.

(The misspelled word 'claimn' has been corrected).

CLAIM 7: A pair of handles in claim 1, wherein the pair of handles is attached to the circular rim of the top portion in a fixed pattern.

(No correction was suggested regarding claim 7).

The purpose of the having handles according to Leiby is to aid in pressing the apparatus downward on to the dough.

Handles according to Leiby and Turner are arranged in a fixed pattern. Reason for having a fixed pattern was not mentioned.

However, the handles in my perforator are not intended to use while pressing the apparatus downward onto the dough unlike Leiby and Turner suggested.

Even though, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide handles, I strongly believe that the handles for my perforator are not intended to aid in pressing the apparatus downward on to the dough.

However, I strongly believe that the handle does not have to be in a fixed pattern as Leiby and Turner suggested. Instead, since the handles to my perforator are useful in lifting the entire apparatus, can be arranged in any pattern desired to avoid folding of fingers as long as the handles are wide enough to place users palms while lifting the entire apparatus. Thus, avoiding repetitive stress syndrome to fingers in the long run.

An apparatus for providing a plurality of perforations in a dough layer prior to baking, the apparatus comprising:

A top portion, a top portion having certain weight; a top portion, the top portion including an upper flat surface of the apparatus; a top portion, the top portion having a flat bottom surface; a plurality of nail like objects being arranged in a fixed pattern; handles means to aid in lifting the apparatus, handles being arranged in any desired pattern.

The weight of the flat surfaced top portion depends on the size of the apparatus.

The weight of the flat surfaced top portion means to provide support for the nail like objects, which are located at the flat bottom surface.

The flat bottom surface of the top portion having several threaded holes means to securely screw the entire nail like objects.

The weight of the entire apparatus does most of the work in perforating the dough layer in very less time possible.

The apparatus provides several required perforations without making noise.

The apparatus can be turned upside down such that the flat surfaced top portion becomes the flat surfaced bottom portion of the apparatus, the flat bottom surface becomes the top portion having nail like objects pointing upwards against the direction of the gravity such that one does not have to lift or move the apparatus.

Please suggest me if I am in the right direction in trying to prove that my new perforator is indeed different though has some similarities in structure when compared to other inventions that are found in the prior art.

I believe that my summary of the present invention have more details, which are different from other prior art found which I could claim under amended claims in the future.